

• An interview with Don Young

(Continued from Page D-1)

constant taking and taking. This is something that should have been done a long time ago. Right now we're at a point where frankly our fishery areas are decimated to the point of a field that has been overpastured by too many cows. There's just nothing but the roots left, and they're eating the roots. When that happens, you have a desert. The solution is not what some people said, to build better and bigger equipment. The sea bed is not an inexhaustible supply of food. The sea bed is a very limited supply of food, and it has to be managed just like a good ranch has to be managed. And it hasn't been done. The foreign fleets, especially the Japanese fleets, practice very little conservation there. This is the sad thing. It's happened: Bristol Bay is an example of it. The state of Alaska has been derelict in their duty. Look at the minute quality of hatcheries we have, the inability of really grappling with the problem of aquaculture, the development of other sources of fisheries, such as the inland salmon industry, which has been done in Puget Sound, you know they turn the thing into a loose lake, and they don't go to high seas, they stay in their local area. The oyster industry, the urchin industry, the development of appetites for other sea foods other than the cream — the halibut and the red snappers and the king salmon and the silver salmon — there are many other products in the sea that can be farmed. What we've done in the past is just take-take-take, and never put anything back. And this is one reason you'll notice in the pipeline bill something that I'm extremely proud of, my provision in that bill, that insurance policy of \$100 million. It never goes below that mark. It's my baby, I nurtured that all the way through the Congress. It's for environmental damage, and restoration, and repayment of any losses incurred because of oil spills, etc. It was a precedent that was set across the nation. It's never been in effect before. And everybody's sort of ignored it, but it's there, and I think it's a step forward, to recognize that there is another industry on the coastal states wherever there's oil involved, or timber, or anything else.

Q. In your travels around the state, do you hear Alaskans who once were saying the pipeline would bring all sorts of riches, now saying they are disturbed by the impact?

A. On the whole, in the long run, they might be good. But immediately, they're going to hurt. You're going to have an influx of people that really don't understand the way of Alaskans, that have possibly a more anti-social feeling towards man, and friendship. The friendliness of feeling might disappear, because it's going to be a boom time. It won't be the first time, I think we'll recover from it. But the initial five years are going to be awfully difficult. I think we can solve some of our problems with the monies that we receive. If we don't, we're darn fools. It was there, it's a national product, we had to have it. I'm glad Alaskans were able to maintain some control over it. Without that control, we'd have been in trouble. I'm saying if there had been a national emergency, like the Second World War when they were building the Alcan Highway, it would be a government issue and we'd really be in trouble.

Q. Do you think Alaskans, or at least the leaders, have spent more time concerned about development than planning for the quality of life?

A. I think a lot of the leaders. Alaskans are well aware of clean air, clean water, all these type things, and I think they're trying to plan. I think they did not on the state level utilize the four years. My argumentation all the way along has been we've got four years to do something. We didn't do anything. And we should have. Now we're in a spot. We've got impact committees, and impact funds, and we're sort of scrambling trying to find out what happened. That should have all been planned ahead of time. And funded. Because we knew the oil was coming. So right now, we're going to have a boom period. I think it will level off. I think we'll be able to grapple with it. I respect those Alaskans that have been here awhile, and a lot of the new people coming will fall in love with

the state such as I have, and be totally dedicated to it. But it's going to be rough.

Q. Do you think Richard Nixon should be impeached?

A. That is a question in my position I'm not going to answer because as I am a member of Congress I serve as a juror and I have to make that decision when the articles are presented by the committee, and I see what type of articles are presented and what issues and what evidence they have. To make a statement prior to that would be a dereliction of my duty. As I told some people today, that decision will be made at the time they call my name out, and I'm eighth from the bottom, so it will be quite a dramatic feeling. When it's done, you can be sure it's done with a great deal of sincerity, integrity, and honesty as I see it. Regardless of which way I vote, there are going to be people who say I voted the wrong way. But I'm there, and I'm the one casting the vote, no one else is going to cast it, for the state of Alaska.

Q. Do you think the mood, the public opinion, is shifting towards the President now?

A. I would say that I don't think it's shifting toward the President, I think the public is beginning to question the activity of the Congress, as I have all along — the role that we're playing, the delay we're doing, the accusation that the White House is delaying. I know this, until four weeks ago, the committee had never seen any of the evidence, just the staffers. Which is ridiculous. The 57 lawyers, they're elected to do the job, not the staffers. If that's all we're going to have, a Congress of staffers, then we should stay home. Hire professionals and just go home. I introduced a resolution that would relieve them of all their other duties. Count them present, count their votes, so they could spend their time on this very serious matter, and it is serious. Not President Nixon or any other official name, it is a serious moment in American history. It's a constitutional question. And really what worries me right now is, is the Judiciary Committee going to come to the floor of the House with good strong articles for impeachment, or are they not going to come to the floor at all. If they come to the floor of the House with articles for impeachment and they are shoddily done, they have done a disservice to the American public, because I very truthfully think right now that because of public opinion, there might be an impeachment vote in favor of impeachment and delivering a very bad case to the Senate. And we act as prosecutors, managers of the impeachment process. They can only use the articles that we voted for in the House and the evidence that we arrived with. So we come forth just like a sloppy grand jury, going before the full jury. And that's a disservice to the American people. I get really aggravated when I hear the committee is rolling. They're really not a cohesive group anymore. And it's dangerous. This will destroy the system of constitutional governing of the President if it's not done right. The question you asked about public sentiment — very frankly, I don't think the President will ever have the support again of the general public that he had during the election.

Q. How disturbed are you about Watergate and all the implications?

A. I made a statement once that I was glad Watergate happened. And people said, "Oh, My God." But in all sincerity, this is a good thing to bring to the focal point how far down the road we have gone in the accumulation of power. It's the executive role — that constant accumulation of power corrupts, as you well know. And it will get to the point where Congress is such an inept body, and the infringement upon the individual rights will become so paramount that if it hadn't come to the front, if Watergate had not happened, in another, perhaps eight years, you could have forgotten your democracy. But now I think we've got a chance. At least, I hope that Congress has got the guts to do it. The leadership of the House supposedly has been trying to, but I haven't seen much action this session. But now is the opportunity to get that power back.

Q. You're not talking about impeachment now, you're talk-

ing about simply taking the reins of government. . . .

ready seen this being started. For instance, committees are requiring yearly reports from these agencies; testimony from them before the committee. Before we never did it, and they did exactly what they wanted to do. And we have government by the agencies themselves and by the executive branch. Congress was just sort of a charade. You know, we haven't come down with a legislative budget in 22 years. It comes from the executive

branch, and that's ridiculous. We haven't come down with a legislative package in 22 years. Where is Congress going to go? Yet in the constitution, nowhere does it say that the President shall govern. It says that the Congress shall govern, and we just gave it up.

Q. Don't you vote closely with the administration position though?

A. No, I think I've got a 47 per cent with the adminis-

tration, or 53, either way. Let's get this correct now — some of the administration votes may be good votes. I'm not saying the administration is all bad. I just think Congress should have the guts to make the decisions as far as the people of the United States. The President should be the administrator of those decisions, but not the decision-maker. And I think that's what the young people have been saying to us all along.

Q. Do you think the Vietnam War is an example of action the President took that could have been changed by Congress?

A. The war would have never happened if Congress didn't want it to happen. The war happened because of Congress allowing it to happen — acquiring and letting the monies go; not bringing President Kennedy and President Johnson to task, and President Nixon,

sooner. The war happened because of Congress. And we had the power to stop it. We didn't have to pass that bill. No where in the Constitution does it say the President has the power to declare war, or indulge in war. So we passed a bill that now gives him 60 days to do what he wants to do. And I voted against that bill for that one reason, it was an assinine bill. That's like giving me 30 minutes to rap you on the side of the head.

JCPenney

\$66

This chic travel tale in four casual chapters includes simply styled solid colored shell top and torso pleated skirt with plaid slacks and fashion collared jacket. Polyester/silk shades of gold with coordinated plaids. Sizes 8-16.



**The Weekender.
Fashionable
traveling tactics.
At JCPenney.**

Shop Monday through Friday 10 til 9, Saturday 10 til 6,
Sunday 12 til 5, with 'free' Sunday Parking in Penneys Parking Garage.